

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark. Office
Adness: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
Advances. Oxform 12 (1977)
Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,896	02/22/2002	Hubert De Steur	32860-000291/US	7394
30596	7590 12/03/2003		EXAM	INER
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O.BOX 8910			ALANKO, ANITA KAREN	
RESTON, VA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1766	

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	10/079,896 Examiner	DE STEUR ET AL.
	Anita K Alanko	1765
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	/ IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 M	MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (5) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period who is a superior of the period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned palent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This a	action is non-final.	
 Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E 	nce except for formal mat Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.E	ters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5-8 and 13</u> is/are with	ndrawn from consideration	n.
5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-4 and 9-12 is/are rejected.		
7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce	epted or b) 🗌 objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c)⊠ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		
Copies of the certified copies of the prior		received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau		
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list o	of the certified copies not	received.
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	of the certified copies not c priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application)
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not c priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application)
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic since a specific reference was included in the firs 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language pro	of the certified copies not c priority under 35 U.S.C. it sentence of the specific visional application has b	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application) eation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received.
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic since a specific reference was included in the firs 37 CFR 1.78.	of the certified copies not c priority under 35 U.S.C. t sentence of the specific visional application has b c priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application) ation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic since a specific reference was included in the firs 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language prov	of the certified copies not c priority under 35 U.S.C. t sentence of the specific visional application has b c priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application) ation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic since a specific reference was included in the firs 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provent 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic reference was included in the first sentence of the Attachment(s) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)	of the certified copies not c priority under 35 U.S.C. t sentence of the specific visional application has b c priority under 35 U.S.C. e specification or in an Ap	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application) ation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the street of th	of the certified copies not copies not copriority under 35 U.S.C. it sentence of the specific visional application has be priority under 35 U.S.C. e specification or in an Ap	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application) ation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific oplication Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Application/Control Number: 10/079,896

Art Unit: 1765

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4 and 9-12, drawn to a method, classified in class 216, subclass 13.
- II. Claims 5-8 and 13, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 219, subclass 1+.The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to conduct a different process such as processing features with different pattern densities from those cited or to form a different device such as a micromachine.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Don Daley on October 31, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-4 and 9-12. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 5-8 and 13 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Application/Control Number: 10/079.896

Art Unit: 1765

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 2, line 22, "67" should recite "63" to be consistent with Figure 5.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,576,402.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of US 6576402 are more broad than the instant invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/079,896

Art Unit: 1765

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-8 of commonly assigned 6,576,402 B2. Specifically, the claims of 6,576,402 are more broad than the instant invention.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302).

Commonly assigned 6,576,402, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee is required under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c) to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anita K Alanko whose telephone number is 703-305-7708

(starting December 11, 2003, 571-272-1458). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon,Tues & Fri: 8:30 am-5 pm; Wed&Thurs:10 am-2 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 703-305-2667 (571-272-1465 starting December 11, 2003). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Anita K. Olenko-Anita K Alanko Primary Examiner Art Unit 1765